



Waukesha County
Criminal Justice Collaborating Council
Evidence-Based Decision Making Phase V Policy Team
Tuesday, February 16, 2016

Team Members Present:

Hon. Jennifer Dorow, Presiding Judge & Policy Team Chair
County Board Chair Paul Decker
State Public Defender Regional Attorney Manager Sam Benedict
DOC Community Corrections Field Supervisor Marla Bell
Victim Witness Coordinator Jen Dunn
Sheriff Eric Severson
Town of Brookfield Municipal Judge JoAnn Eiring
County Executive Paul Farrow

CJCC Coordinator Rebecca Luczaj
WCS Administrator Sara Carpenter
HHS Director Antwayne Robertson
Clerk of Circuit Court Kathy Madden
District Court Administrator Michael Neimon
Captain Dan Baumann
DOC Regional Chief Sally Tess

Team Members Absent:

Menomonee Falls Police Chief Anna Ruzinski

District Attorney Sue Opper

Others Present:

Janelle McClain
Corina VanDuser
State Special Projects Coordinator Tommy Gubbin

NIC Consultant Mimi Carter

Welcome

Chair Dorow called the meeting to order at 12:09 p.m.

Review Goals and Agenda for the Meeting

- Report Out on Progress of Workgroups
- Discuss How to Build Informed EBDM Agencies and Staff
- Start Developing the Waukesha EBDM Scorecard and Communications Strategy
- Discuss Next Steps

Madden asked what research has already been done so the team does not have to reinvent the wheel. Carter responded that it would be more beneficial for there to be specific topics to request assistance with rather than a broad topic. However, to some degree, NIC does not want to supply all the answers, so people are encouraged to do the research themselves, since there will always be new issues and topics that should be explored. For resource tools, Carter stated that there are about five key websites that were distributed on a handout at the June workshop. The information is good for the general population, but there is not much information specific to case processing or mental health.

Approve Minutes

Motion: Baumann moved, Robertson second, to approve the minutes of January 19, 2016. Motion carried unanimously.

Workgroup Co-Chair Updates & Discussion

Pretrial Workgroup

Dorow reported that the workgroup met last week. The six people who will be attending the NIC Pretrial Executives training from March 7-10 are: Dorow, Luczaj, Oppen, Benedict, JoAnn Eiring from WCS, and Commissioner Lau. She believes that they will be getting a lot of answers at the training. Carter recommended that the group present what they learned at the March Policy Team meeting.

The committee is tweaking a tool that was developed with DOT funding about 6 years ago, but was never implemented. It looks specifically at the OWI population and the dosage of supervision for each level of risk. They are also hoping to get answers regarding scoring the tool. Carpenter said that the group agreed that it was a good tool, but that WCS, as the current service provider, would be given the discretion to determine dosage of supervision. State funding ends June 30, 2016. Defendants would be ordered over and then screened by WCS as the case management provider. No additional funding would be needed from the county, and it would take at least a month to implement. Also, WCS will be looking at a defendant's entire criminal history in CCAP for pretrial screening reports, which goes back to approximately the early 1990's.

Carpenter reported that a new computerized tool will be implemented for drug testing to better randomize the selection process using a computer, versus the staff. This can be done without any cost, and it will alleviate concerns by different justice partners. They are looking to implement it as soon as possible, possibly a week or two, as well as presenting on the system to the team, judges, and whomever else is recommended.

Case Processing Workgroup

Neimon informed the team that the Case Processing Workgroup consists of himself, Oppen, Judge Ramirez, Madden, attorney Dan Fay, Commissioner Dehring, and attorney Katie Bricco from the Public Defender's Office.

The workgroup is reviewing why cases are getting bogged down in the system, as well as the excessive amount of rescheduling for trials. Originally, the focus was going to be on pretrial conferencing, but the need is to look at the entire case – from beginning to end.

Madden and Judge Ramirez will be working with a legal clerk to examine specific cases over a period of time to identify where and why delays are occurring. The workgroup is also looking at how to reduce the number of scheduled trials, which will allow all parties to focus resources on cases which are more likely to go to trial.

Madden commented that some of the current practices seen in the court system are probably not best practices to help cases move along, so they want to apply some LEAN logic to handle those situations.

Carter asked if there is a disincentive to close a case quickly because of attorneys being paid by the hour. Dorow responded that when she was in private practice, she usually charged a flat fee, not hourly. When people could not pay up front and needed more time, there could be a payment plan established.

Mental Health Workgroup

Robertson reported that the workgroup met on February 4th to review the system mapping and finalize the committee's goal of focusing on the service piece, the relationship between the criminal justice system and the mentally ill person, making sure the right action and response is taking place from initial contact to release or hospitalization.

Rob Mueller and Dr. Gordon Owley reviewed the original system mapping done by the Policy Team and determined there were some process errors regarding Chapters 51 and 55, so they revised the map to reflect current practice.

While there are components of substance abuse, Robertson stated that it is not part of the committee's goal at this time. It is one of the things that can be focused on as data is reviewed. The main focus is the commitments, Chapters 51 and 55, and the crisis deadline for face-to-face contact.

Robertson commented that the need for an intermediate respite care facility is being explored, where people can go, be stabilized, and then be released.

Victim Issues Workgroup

Dunn listed the workgroup members as herself, Bell, Madden, Judge Aprahamian, Stephanie Hove from DOC, and attorney Kelsey Morin from the Public Defender's Office.

Dunn reported that the goals of the workgroup are focused on victims' rights being satisfied at all stages in the criminal justice process, increasing the collection of restitution for victims, and training collaboration to increase awareness of the victim experience. They identified a few areas where more data is needed.

Review Policy Team Accomplishments To-Date

Carter commented that the Policy Team needs to build a list of accomplishments. Some of the tasks may bear immediate results while others take some time to see the success. She wants the committee to be reminded that there are ancillary benefits to what is being done as a group.

Accomplishments to add to the list so far include: implementation of computerized random drug testing, the collaboration with other justice system members (not just on the committee or workgroups, but outside as well), and the addition of lifetime CCAP background checks in the Pretrial Screening program.

Discuss Steps to Building Knowledgeable, Engaged EBDM Agencies/Staff

Carter stated that there have been other policy teams like this one, identifying areas for improvement. The teams determined what could be improved and how to make the improvements. Some jurisdictions went on to determine whom would be affected by the implementation. She also reminded the committee of the need to give others the opportunity to get ready for the change and process the new information and how things are/will be done. Problems can be prevented by doing the thinking and anticipating now instead of later.

Madden commented that there are 6 counties doing this, as well as a state team. Perhaps the work involved could be shared amongst everyone.

The committee broke into 3 groups to discuss communication strategies. Below is what was shared with the group on the whiteboards.

Group 1:

- Agency Targets:
 - County Board
 - Judiciary
 - Clerk of Courts
 - Law Enforcement
 - Bar Association
- Strategies:
 - Identify agency leader to educate/train to move agency forward
 - It could be someone other than who is on the team
 - Training
 - County Website
 - Basic Education
 - Create/Expand Workgroups
 - Obtain data analyst for county

Group 2:

- Audiences: Public Defender, DHHS, WCS, County Board, Waukesha Police
- Opportunities:
 - Public Defender – State agency: interest in state and local EBDM. Benedict has staff on all workgroups and he shares EBDM information at staff meetings
 - County Board – Decker has Luczaj present to the Judiciary Committee and also reports out to the Executive Committee. It is important to explain the purpose and effectiveness of EBDM.
 - DHHS – Robertson and Luczaj can present to the DHHS Executive management team, who takes the information to division personnel.
 - WCS – has membership on EBDM Policy Team and work groups, Carpenter provides updates to leadership at staff trainings, information can be posted on the WCS Intranet and website.
 - Waukesha PD: Communication is done at the command staff level and also through CIT training.
- Need:
 - 5 main talking points as a group to various audiences
 - Cross Agency Outreach:
 - Strategic – who presents
 - Impact on organization
 - Create an understanding of system map and interaction, as well as responsibilities of all partners

Group 3:

- Various audiences:
 - Prosecution/Victim Witness
 - County Leaders/Supervisors
 - Private Bar
 - DOC
 - Law enforcement
 - Courts/Clerks
 - Legislators (getting them to understand why we need this)
 - Community
 - Health Care Providers/Mental Health

- Need:
 - Data Person/PIO (Public Information Officer)
 - Methods of Delivery

There was discussion regarding what a Data Analyst/Public Information Officer would specifically handle, should one be hired. Madden stated that it is not just capturing data, but also analyzing/interpreting the data for the audiences we are serving, and providing support to CJCC. Luczaj will forward the data analyst information from Eau Claire County to County Executive Farrow.

Discussion continued regarding identifying consistent talking points that the committee agrees on, in an attempt to bring other employees on board with the EBDM initiative. Dorow commented that it depends on who is being talked to. Some areas to look at would be the mission statement, as well as being able to explain the who/what/why/how. From that point, more details can be given. This can help people understand what is going on and why, giving them the opportunity to offer information and knowledge to help move the initiative forward.

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.